

DA
953
1881
.B7



GLADSTONE AND IRISH GRIEVANCES.



AN ESSAY

ON THE

IRISH LAND LAWS, TENURES AND GRIEVANCES;

THEIR PROPOSED SOLUTION;

THE GLADSTONE COERCION ACT AND LAND BILL;

AND

THE LAND LEAGUE.

BY

HENRY A. BRANN,

OF THE

New York Bar.



NEW YORK:

BENJ. H. TYRREL, PRINTER, 74 MAIDEN LANE.

-:-

1881.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1881,

BY HENRY A. BRANN,

In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

TO

MY BEST FRIEND AND TUTOR

Rev. Henry J. Brann, D.D.,

AS A TOKEN OF GRATITUDE AND LOVE.

THIS PAMPHLET IS DEDICATED.

P R E F A C E .

AMERICANS are by nature generous, grateful, considerate and tenacious. They love liberty and hate oppression; they are cool and cautious, hence slow to change opinions once formed. Their European knowledge being derived almost exclusively from English authors, who, either from ignorance or prejudice, misrepresent everything anti-English, it is not surprising to find frequently the American mind poisoned against the staunchest friends and the best interests of the Republic. The education and training of the average American youth are such as to render him quick and self-reliant, but he is very rarely correctly informed upon European questions. He studies too many things to be more than ordinarily proficient in anything. Nor is this true only of those compelled to earn their livelihood at an early age, but also of many of the members of the learned professions. How many even among the graduates of colleges have read the Penal Code, or know the true history of Ireland? Yet how often have we heard these very men declaim against the turbulence and ignorance of the Irish?

How many of them picture Irish gentlemen in the persons of their coachmen, or Irish ladies in the persons of their cooks? How many form sweeping opinions of the Irish from reports in the daily press of arrests and convictions among the criminal classes? How many look upon the swaggering official occasionally met at the City Hall as the true representative of Irish gentility, or recognize in the blatant assemblyman at Albany the true type of Irish culture?

Yet it is as unjust to judge the Irish by such persons as it would be to measure the intelligence of Americans by that of the backwoodsman of the North, or that of the emancipated slave of the South. Is it fair to compare the lettered American with the unlettered Irishman; the professional with the layman; the cultured with the uncultured; the mechanic with the unskilled laborer?

The Irish, with few exceptions, come to this country to earn their bread by manual labor, not to acquire literary fame or to gain professional distinction. With equal advantages, and under similar conditions in life, the Irish will compare favorably even with Americans.

This *brochure* has been written with the view of reflecting sufficient light upon the Irish Question to induce the inquisitive American, for whose special benefit it is published, to examine Irish as well as English authorities on the subject, and then draw his own conclusions which, no doubt, will be impartial.

New York, April 15, 1881.

HENRY A. BRANN.

GLADSTONE AND IRISH GRIEVANCES.

THE question of Irish grievances has been agitating the world, but particularly the English speaking portion of it, for many centuries, and it yet remains unsolved. The people of Ireland have been obliged to emigrate to Great Britain and to her colonies, as well as to Continental Europe, and wherever they go they are to her a cause of anxiety and disturbance. Even into lands not subject to her imperial sway, as the United States, or in countries foreign to her in race, creed and speech, they have carried the story of their wrongs, and transmitted the ever burning tradition of her injustice and persecutions. The gory ghost will not down at her bidding. Neither enormous capital nor a powerful press can smother the irrepressible conflict of Irish public opinion, aggressive, persistent and ever growing in force in every spot where an Irish colony exists, whether in London or Glasgow, in Australia or Canada, in the United States or in France, Spain or Austria. The bitter hostility of the Irish blood to the English government is as strong in the McMahons, O'Donnells or Nugents, now French, Spanish or Austrian for several generations, as in the millions of naturalized Irishmen and their descendants in our own mighty Republic, of whose strength they constitute one of the most important and powerful elements. A marked peculiarity of this Irish public opinion is that English concessions only make it stronger. Repeatedly has the English government, morally forced into yielding, relaxed the severity of its oppression; and yet the Irish cry is still for more concessions; each hard wrung right serving but as another step in the climax of aspiration for race independence and national liberty. The cry for Home Rule and for the abolition of oppressive laws has been taken up by

the Liberals even of England, and, swelled by the accretion of the public sympathy of impartial thinkers elsewhere, grows louder and stronger with age, as every cause must which is based on the idea of right and justice. Truth is powerful and eventually will prevail. Right may be stricken down and lie helpless for a time, but, as the idea which sustains it is immortal, it can never be annihilated but like an indestructible germ it will burst into life though wrapped for ages in the cerements of a mummy.

— At the present time there is no subject more strikingly presented to the American people than the Irish question. To some of them it is an offensive question. They are tired of hearing it discussed and often at a loss to understand its meaning; the meaning of the denunciation by the organs of Irish public opinion of a government that is generally supposed to be the most free in the world, and that has been pluming itself for centuries on its superiority to continental despotisms; the meaning of inflammatory speeches by Irish orators; of Fenian insurrections, subsidized by the contributions of even the poorest servant girls and laborers; the meaning of a thing hitherto unknown in Irish history, a partial renunciation of sacerdotal leadership in political matters by the Irish laity; and, stranger yet, a renunciation in some cases by Irish enthusiasts of the faith of their fathers, because it seemed to trammel their revolutionary purposes; the meaning of the recent Irish famine, and the wild ovations given by Irishmen in every city of this glorious Republic to a man whose avowed purpose is to overthrow English supremacy by abrogating the land laws which give to the British nobility and gentry their prestige and their power, and thus Americanize the whole English system of land tenure and politics.

— There are two causes of grievances, two sources of hostility on the part of the Irish against their English conquerors, the one religious, the other political. The element of race, technically so called, has little to do with the difficulty; for, as the blending of Brittons, Romans, Saxons and Normans has destroyed the original Anglo-Saxon breed, so has the blending of Danes, Normans and English with the Irish Celts changed their normal condition. There is, it is true, an Irish national type, a

there is an English national type, but there is neither a pure Celtic nor a pure Anglo-Saxon race in existence.

Although the religious element of discord between the two nations is not so old as the political one, it may be well to say a word about it first, as it is gradually losing its importance in the struggle. Since Catholic Emancipation in 1829, a spirit of religious liberty has spread throughout the British Empire.

The attacks made upon the Anglican Church by infidelity and the independent sects, has made her more desirous of forming an alliance with the old conservative Church which is now rising into power, and developing into numerical strength in every town and city of Great Britain, from the Highlands of Scotland to Land's End. The Anglicans want a truce with the Catholic Church even though they may not love her.

The removal of penal disabilities from the Catholics of Ireland, and especially the recent Disestablishment has made them comparatively content on the score of religion. Of course there are still many annoyances to which Catholics are subject; the spirit of the penal laws survives their death; but there is a general dying out of the old spirit of bigotry which butchered Catholic women and children at Drogheda, and Wexford, under Cromwell; bigotry nurtured by the butcheries of Coote in Wicklow and Meath. These massacres of Irish "papists" and countless others, done with the full sanction of the English Parliament, must naturally still foster a feeling of bitterness in the minds of the Catholic Irish. Nor has the memory of the penal laws been yet effaced. By those laws no Catholic could settle a jointure on his Catholic wife, or charge his land with any provision for his daughters; or make a will disposing of his landed property. If the wife of a Catholic declared herself a Protestant, she could force her husband to give her a separate maintenance and to transfer to her the guardianship of all their children, thus creating discord in the family. If the eldest son of a Catholic father, however young, declared himself a Protestant, he thereby made his father strict tenant for life, depriving him of all right to sell or dispose of his estate, and such son became entitled to the absolute domain and ownership

of the estate. If any other child than the eldest became a Protestant, that child became free of parental control, and the father was compelled to support the rebel.

Thus did the law not only sanction but encouraged disobedience to the commandment of God, "Honor thy father and thy mother." Any Protestant could take away the land bought by a Catholic and pay him nothing for it. Thus the Catholic lost both his money and his land. No Catholic could inherit land from any relative. Any Protestant could take by law such land from its Catholic owner. If a Catholic leased a farm of land for a term not exceeding thirty-one years and by his labor and industry so improved it as to make it yield a profit, not exceeding one-third of the rental, any Protestant might then by law evict him and enjoy for the residue of the term the fruits of the labor and industry of the Catholic. Thus was there a penalty put upon the labor and industry of the Catholic. If a Catholic had a horse worth more than five pounds, any Protestant could take it by offering this amount, although the horse might be worth one hundred pounds. Any Catholic concealing such horse from a Protestant was liable to three months' imprisonment and a fine of three times the value of the horse. These were the chief penal laws against Catholics holding property. The laws against Catholic education were still worse. If a Catholic kept a school or taught any person, Protestant or Catholic, any species of literature or science, he was punishable by banishment, and if he returned from banishment he was liable to be hanged as a felon. A Catholic child attending a Catholic school in Ireland, forfeited all his property, present or future. The same punishment was inflicted on a Catholic child that went abroad to be educated in a Catholic college. Any Irishman paying for the education of a child in a foreign Catholic college, forfeited all his property. A Catholic could not be an officer in the army or navy; he could not be even a private soldier. He could hold no office in the state of any description. He could not be a judge, grand juror, sheriff, barrister, solicitor, attorney, agent or even a game-keeper.

In some Irish towns Catholics were not permitted to dwell. They were politically like the negro slaves in the

South before the war. They had no rights which a Protestant was bound to respect. The penal laws against the clergy were simply brutal. To teach the Catholic religion was a felony punishable by transportation. To convert a Protestant was a capital offense, punishable as treason. Monks or friars were banished, and if they returned they were adjudged guilty of high treason and hanged. Bishops or abbots were transported, and if they returned they were hanged, disemboweled and quartered. Large rewards were offered for the apprehension of Catholic schoolmasters and priests, so that the "knife" which Curran says is the proper symbol of the informer's profession became the idol of the "priest-hunter." The celebrated Edmund Burke, an Irish Protestant, speaking of the system of penal laws says: "It had a vicious perfection; it was a complete system, full of coherence and consistency, well digested and well disposed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of the people and the debasement in them of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." It is not so long since those laws have been abolished that the Irish Catholics should have forgotten them. The child does not forget in the afternoon the lashing of the morning. Still the spirit of Christian charity and the love of national liberty are gradually effacing the vestiges of those infamous laws which must have been "framed by devils and hatched in hell." In religious matters England has become liberal, and we can agree with Cardinal Manning, that Catholics are to-day better treated in his Protestant country, than in many of the so called Catholic nations of Europe. Irish grievances on the score of religion may be considered virtually settled. A peaceful revolution, prompted by the interest and good sense of the English people may solve the political grievances of Ireland before the end of the present century. If not, they will eventually be solved by a bloody conflict. The religious grievances of Ireland began with the Reformation; her political grievances began at an earlier date, they commenced with the Norman invasion and English dominion in Ireland, about the middle of the twelfth century.

The two grievances were sometimes united, as during the days of the penal laws, but the political troubles pre-existed and have survived the religious. While the religious grievances existed, the Irish, always ardently attached to their religion, sometimes sacrificed their political interest to their religious feeling. This is especially true in the case of their defence of the English King James II. They shed their blood for him although he cared very little for them and manifested no appreciation of their loyalty and fidelity. He was an ungrateful, weak, cowardly man, far inferior in every respect to William of Orange. The Irish made the blunder of fighting for a despot and were severely punished for it by his political competitor. Neither Charles I nor James II deserved the sympathy or support of the Irish nation. These kings were foreigners, and appreciated the Irish only so far as it subserved their own selfish interests. They paid taxes and filled the royal coffers; they were good soldiers and fought the royal battles. The invading Normans, although nominally Catholics, treated the Irish with extreme cruelty. Their attempt to subjugate the island, however, was never fully successful. For several centuries a small portion of the Eastern province of Leinster, called the "Pale," was the only part of Ireland that acknowledged the English power. War raged between the English colony and the Irish from A. D. 1172, for about five hundred years, continuing through the reign of Elizabeth, who made desperate efforts to subdue the Irish, until the reign of James I, when, if not conquered, they were at least for a time kept silent. During these centuries of struggle, massacre and confiscation marked the advance of the invading power. The Norman, always cruel, seems to have outdone his ordinary barbarity while endeavoring to subdue the Irish. They were denominated "Irish enemies" in all the royal proclamations, royal charters and acts of parliament. The English were prohibited from intermarrying with them, as the Irish wives succeeded in denationalizing their English husbands and making them "more Irish than the Irish themselves," and what is still stranger, the English were forbidden to sell wares or goods of any kind to them. To murder an Irishman was no crime

for an English colonist; unless the Irishman happened to have made submission and had been received into English allegiance, and even in this case his murder was punishable only by fine. It is not to be supposed that the Irish remained patient during those ages of war. They retaliated with all their native vindictiveness, and who could blame them? and many an English garrison and marauding party fell victims to the fierce valor of the Irish chieftains. The early confiscations of Irish property for the benefit of Norman adventurers were surpassed by the subsequent ones. During the reign of James I, in the early part of the seventeenth century, the entire province of Ulster was taken away from its native owners, who were all either hanged, slaughtered or driven into the Western bogs and mountains. Their places were filled with Scotch adventurers who had embraced Protestantism, and petted and fostered as these have ever been by the parent government; industry and commerce of various kinds encouraged among them, is it any wonder that they should have succeeded where the hunted and persecuted Irish peasants have failed? Is it just, in view of the different treatment given by the government to the native Irish, and the important "Ulster Plantation" to attribute the commercial superiority of the latter to innate thrift or natural industry? The veriest drones would have thriven and prospered under such encouragement as James, a Scotchman himself, gave to his Scotch countrymen settled in Ireland. In the reign of Charles the I, the crown confiscated the estates of the Irish in three provinces to the amount of over one million acres of land, yet the Irish Catholics, committing a fault, similar to that which they afterwards repeated in defending the rights of James II, against William of Orange, took up arms for Charles, and were slaughtered by St. Leger, Monroe, Tichbourne, Treton, and Cromwell. At the end of this war Cromwell transported eighty thousand Irish to the West Indies to be sold as slaves. James the second, although a Catholic, took eighty thousand acres of the land confiscated by his father, yet the Irish forgave him and foolishly shed their blood for him afterwards at the battle of the Boyne. The Irish army, thirty thousand strong, capitulated to William of Orange at Limerick. The treaty of Limerick, guaranteed to the Irish the free and

unfettered exercise of their religion, but it was broken "ere the ink wherewith 'twas writ could dry." The Irish could expect little better from William, a foreigner, whom the English had called to be their king. The penal laws followed and remained more or less in force until Catholic Emancipation became an accomplished fact, in 1829. Since that time the chief Irish grievances have been of a political character. The Irish complain that the English Government discourages commerce and puts a penalty on the industry of the people. They point to the harbors of Cork, Limerick, Kingstown, Galway and Waterford, and the many seaports on the insular coast, and ask the English Government why it has done nothing for Irish commerce. The answer is that the English merchants do not wish the trade to be diverted from Liverpool, Plymouth, and the other English seaports. There are mines of copper in Wicklow, Waterford, Cork and Tipperary; gold in Wicklow, and lead, tin, zinc, marble and salt beds in various parts of the island. Why does not the English Government encourage the working of these industries? Because they would interfere with the mines of Cornwall or Wales. Rivers and lakes abound in the island; yet the laws prevent the people from catching the fish in them. The laws prevent the peasants from fishing in the waters that are owned by feudal lords living in baronial splendor, while the poor serfs are dying of starvation in the hovels within sight of the leaping trout and salmon.

The serf dares not shoot a bird, or spear a salmon, or catch a hare for himself and his famishing children. The law forbids it, and forbids him further to own a gun or a pistol, or a pike or a spear. The birds may fly in the air, the fish may leap in the brook, destined by nature's God for the sustenance of the poor, yet the law, the iniquitous law, will condemn to penal servitude the starving Irishman who dares to assert his right to them by force. Yet the Irish are not by nature a patient people. Religion holds them in check.

As there are neither factories nor commerce in Ireland, owing to the selfish policy of the English Government, the peasantry are obliged to depend chiefly on the land for their support. When the land fails them they have nothing. The English or Scotch farmer can go to Glasgow or Liver-

pool, or Manchester or Sheffield, if the paternal acres be found too small to support him, and find in the many channels of commerce the means of support. A few hours' ride in the railway cars brings him from the home of penury into comparative plenty. Not so the poor Irishman: he does not understand commerce, for there is none for him to learn in Ireland. He must leave his own country and go to foreign parts, and there meet contempt and ridicule for his country and his creed. He therefore depends on the land solely for support; and the chief Irish grievance of the present time is the land question. The Irish peasant has reason to believe that when St. Patrick drove the snakes and toads from the land, they took possession of the cruel landlords, and still live in them. He looks around him and sees that nearly all the land now owned by the landlords, was confiscated perhaps only a hundred years ago, and that some of it was then owned by his own ancestors. Traditions are always vivid in a pastoral or an agricultural community. Is it a marvel that doubts as to the validity of the present owners' title should cross his mind, especially if he knows that prescribed and compulsory possession can never remove the cloud from a title acquired by force and fraud. He is a tenant to the grandson of some Williamite or Cromwellian soldier: a tenant at will, liable to be evicted on short notice, with a helpless family to provide for.

He is not a tenant: he can never be an owner. The law prevents him from ever owning an inch of the soil which he tills, and which his grandfather had seen tilled: of the spot in which he was born, and in which his ancestors for generations may have been born. For it is well to remember that although mere tenants at will, still Irish soldiers have lived for a century in the same place, owing to the good will of the landlords. Certain families, slaves to the State, were sometimes never separated, never sold when the planters were of a benevolent race, and there were some such. But the danger and fear of sale, like the terror of eviction for an Irish peasant family, always hung like the sword of Damocles over their head. The peasant not only can never become an owner, but there is a penalty for his industry. Let him cultivate the acres too well, let the hedges bloom in beauty, instead of remaining dilapidated: let him dress

well, or dare to dress his children well, or assume the appearance of comfort at his peril. If he do, his rent will be increased by a landlord who lives in Paris or London, and manages his estates in Ireland through some unprincipled "squireen" of the "Corry Kinchella" stamp. He pays rent from the sale of the crops; sells a pig, or a calf, or a foal once or twice a year at a neighboring fair, and thus tries to eke out a miserable existence from year to year, his family ever increasing, for the Irish peasant is not a believer in the theology of Malthus. Now if the season is bad, or if the crops fail, what becomes of the poor peasant? He starves and dies, as he died from 1847 to 1851, and as he died during the recent famine; dies by the operation of English laws cruelly kept in existence by the English Parliament through the influence and selfishness of landlords and capitalists.

If he were an infidel he would assassinate his landlord or join a secret society for murdering capitalists like the Carbonari, of Southern Italy, or the Nihilists of Russia. Being a Catholic, obedient to his Church, he is patient and suffers, to use his own familiar phrase, "his purgatory in this world." Is it a wonder, in view of such a state of affairs, that the Irish peasant sometimes in his great trials loses his patience, loses it when he sees his wife and babe evicted and dying of hunger in the ditch; refuses to hear the voice of his priest, and plots the murder of the heartless landlord? Is it a wonder in view of such a state of oppression, that there should have been an Irish rebellion in 1798, and another in 1848, and that generous Protestants laying aside their religious feelings should have been its leaders, for Emmett, Wolf Tone, Smith O'Brien, and John Mitchell, were all Protestants?

Do we wonder more at Fenian insurrections, and the hatred of the Irish for the English Government? For mark there is a little more than twenty millions of acres of land in Ireland. "One-third of this land is owned by two hundred and ninety-two persons. One-half by seven hundred and forty-four persons. Twelve men in Ireland own one hundred and eighty thousand acres of land each, while about three millions of the people are tenants at will, that is, they can practically never own an inch of Irish soil so long as the present laws regarding land tenure exist, and are completely at the mercy of their

landlords. "These three millions live from hand to mouth."*

Their food is of the poorest quality ; their clothing of the coarsest. There are thousands of Irishmen who seldom or ever eat a morsel of roast beef, beefsteak or mutton, during their natural lives. Oat meal and potatoes are the diet of the Irish small farmer and laborer, very rarely a bit of bacon with his greens on Sunday, but rarely, if ever, fresh meat of any description. He may buy a herring for a half-penny ; but the good salmon and trout must go to the table of the landlord. It must sound strangely in American ears to learn that many of the able-bodied Irishmen, aged twenty-five and thirty, who daily land upon our shores, have never tasted fresh meat in their own country, yet the ancestors of these very men who are thus starving, were the rightful owners of the three millions of acres confiscated by James I, in Ulster ; of the eight millions of acres confiscated by Cromwell, and of the million acres confiscated by William of Orange. They know this and they feel it just as keenly in this country as they did in Ireland.

There is no chance for an Irish peasant farmer ever to own the land which he tills. The feudal law of primogeniture, unjustly gives all the land of the father to the eldest son, and treats the younger sons as if they were illegitimate ; and mediæval laws of entail, which in some cases deprive the female children of all rights to their father's landed property, serve to keep up the land monopolies and to increase rather than diminish the power and wealth of the landlords, almost half of whom are absentees, never live in Ireland, but spend in living in luxury and licentiousness abroad the money wrung from the poor Irish serfs. Some ten years ago an attempt was made to modify the land monopoly despotism of Ireland by the passage of what is known as "The Encumbered Estates Court Act." By this act the law of entail was abolished in regard to estates that had become embarrassed by mortgages or other encumbrances. Formerly such estates could be thrown into Chancery and held by the creditor until his debts were paid. They then reverted back to the original owners. But they could not be sold. Now they can be sold, but the tenants cannot buy them, for they are

*John Bright, Birmingham Speech.

not sold in small parcels but as a whole, and are generally bought up by large corporations composed of English and Scotch speculators, so that the law intended to benefit only injures the tenantry, for their new landlords are, if possible, more exacting and heartless than their old ones.

The tenants cannot buy their homesteads even if they have the money, for they cannot compete with London and Glasgow capitalists. If the land were sold in small parcels the tenants could purchase, for foreign corporations or speculators would not take the trouble to buy small pieces of land, as the investment would be too insignificant. "The Encumbered Estates Court Act" has therefore proved an absolute failure; after a fair trial it has not accomplished the object for which it was passed, nor does it in any way relieve the necessities or supply the wants of the people.

Mr. Gladstone, in a speech delivered at the opening of Parliament in January, 1881, said: "*We are obliged, by the evidence, to admit that the provisions of the act (of 1870) have not prevented undue and frequent augmentations of rent which were not justified by the real value of the holding, but have been brought in in consequence of the superior strength of the position of the landlords.*"

In Ireland there is no real estate market as in this country; nor, owing to the law of entail and primogeniture, which regulate the descent, and transmission of property, can real estate there be said to be at all in commerce. While the American, Frenchman, Belgian or Prussian can own his own house and lot, sell it to whom he pleases, buy another if he has the money, the Irish peasant is, properly speaking, houseless. No wonder the hovels of these poor people should be wretched, and not fit for cattle to live in, why should the peasants embellish them? They are not theirs, they belong to the landlords, "and the landlords must be a degraded set of human beings, to leave such evidence of human misery erect on their estates; and force their tenants to live with pigs and cows"* Nor is it fair to charge these peasants with lack of thrift, and contrast them with the Scotch. We in the United States know that the Irish are thrifty. Their thrift and

*Fannie Parnell's Irish Hovels.

industry have been proven beyond question in Canada and Australia, as well as here. They save their money, educate their children, buy farms, become successful merchants and agriculturalists, distinguished physicians, authors, actors, lawyers, and statesmen, whenever and wherever they get a fair opportunity.

In Ireland industry is punished by higher rents, and thrift is rewarded by eviction; and this state of affairs has lasted for centuries. It is a great mistake to suppose that the Scotch are naturally more industrious than the Irish. It is true that the "Plantation of Ulster" flourished under the fostering care of James I. The same royal Scotchman favored his own country when he became King of England. Scotland gained by the union of the crowns.

She was not conquered by invasion like Ireland. It was she that annexed England, and put her James VI on the English throne; she kept her own laws, her own Church supported by the State, and obtained all the commercial favors she desired from England after the union in the reign of Queen Anne. Ireland invaded, persecuted, crushed, her national religion outlawed, her lands confiscated for the benefit of her enemies, and her national life almost extinguished, how can she be compared with ever-favored Scotland? Yet such is the vitality of the Irish people that, although scarcely fifty years have elapsed since Catholic Emancipation, and after centuries of despotic cruelty sufficient to have stamped out of existence every spark of manhood and independence in an ordinary people, she is now rising into great power despite the recent famine. She counts her sons as twenty-five millions, scattered in every part of the earth.

In Cromwell's time they were not more than a million. Their political power is felt in the very largest centres of English wealth; and they actually rule her colonies. But a few years ago, one of her exiled sons, Charles Gavan Duffy, governed Australia, while D'Arcy McGee controlled Canada, and both were Irish rebels of 1848. To-day her band of resolute obstructionists is feared in the Imperial Parliament which has hitherto sneered at the mere mention of Irish political grievances. In fact a new era has dawned for the Irish people, and they may soon add to the glory of being

the only race who support Christianity on the voluntary principle, that of reforming the British Constitution, destroying its superannuated feudalism, and Americanizing illiberal laws.

How shall this be done? How shall an end be put to Irish grievances? Will it be by a peaceful revolution, by constitutional measures, dictated by the good sense and fairness of the English Parliament, or will it be by a civil war? There are many answers to these questions. There is a class of Irishmen who believe in dynamite and the dagger; who consider any means justifiable to get rid of Irish landlords and English oppression. They would have in Ireland, if they could, a Sicilian vespers, or a St. Bartholomew's day, and if possible would induce the tenant farmers, armed with daggers, to take every man his landlord and end the despotism by a general assassination.

The English Government should mark well the increase in the numbers of Irishmen who, despite of priest and law, are strong believers in this horrible remedy for the woes of their country. The late Earl of Leitrim, a powerful landlord, was assassinated, and the government, although offering a large reward, has not yet been able to find the assassin.

It is sad to see Irishmen become Nihilists or Carbonari. The Fenians, who have so frequently been heard of during the last twenty years, although not supporters of the assassination remedy, yet do believe in the sword, in civil war and insurrection.

They have attempted rebellion; have broken out in insurrection, and some of them have paid for their so-called treason the penalty of transportation. They deny the legal right of England to Ireland, and claim that if she ever did have a legitimate title to the sovereignty of Ireland, she has lost it through neglect and cruelty. They say that the child is not bound to honor the cruel parent or to obey him; the wife may leave her husband's bed and board on account of bad treatment; why should a whole people be bound by stricter ties of loyal obedience to a despotic government than wife or child? When the English Government neglects the people of Ireland and allows them to starve, the obligation of loyalty ceases. They say that the great theologian St. Thomas, justifies rebellion under certain cir-

cumstances, and quote the following from his "Summa Theologia" as proof: "Laws are unjust in two ways, first, when they are opposed to the common weal," —as are the laws which caused the famines in Ireland, —second, "when they are onerous, and imposed by a government not for the good of the common weal, but for the sake of self-interest or ambition; or on account of their authors not being vested with proper faculties; again they may be unjust in form, as when the taxes are unequally divided among the multitude, although in other respects tending to the public good." Such laws are rather outrages than laws: since St. Augustine says: "An unjust law is not binding." They will even cite passages from Balmes and Suarez to justify insurrection against English misrule in Ireland. Now there are many who, although deeply attached to the conservative teachings of the Catholic Church in the matters of civic obedience to the powers that be, believe with the Fenians, that the English Government has no right of conquest in Ireland, or that if she ever had, she has forfeited it by her ill treatment of the Irish people. They say the relations between governed and governing are ~~natural~~; the contract must be kept on both sides, and England has shamefully broken it, if it ever existed at all, so far as the consent of the Irish is concerned. It is said that if you scratch a Russian you will find a Cossack, and it will be found generally true, that if you scratch an Irishman you will find a Fenian, in theory at least. The Fenians also claim that nothing has ever been, or ever will be granted to Ireland by England, except from fear of the sword, and that agitation amounts to nothing. The surpassing eloquence of Grattan, they say, failed utterly to obtain the Independence of the Irish Parliament: but the volunteers of 1782 presented an argument in favor of the measure which the English Government did not dare to dispute. It is true that agitation in those days was not prolific of good results. Statesmen then never dreamed of settling national disputes in any other way than by force.

The mere suggestion of shaming a government into granting relief to the oppressed would have been ridiculed, and the idea of forcing a government by threats or warnings to repeal or reform unjust and oppressive laws would have been

laughed at as Chatham was when he exclaimed in the English Parliament, "Do justice to America, do it to-night, do it before you sleep." But they forget that O'Connell wrung Catholic Emancipation from an English Parliament by agitation, by constitutional means, under the most extraordinary difficulties. For the Irish Catholics, without influence, education, wealth or prestige, were the only persons directly interested in the measure, and the support given to it by Protestants was accorded only by the liberal few, the many being either openly opposed to it or passively indifferent. He was struggling for the Catholics, not for the whole people, at least this seems to have been the view entertained by the great majority of Protestants. The Fenians may say that O'Connell was one of the greatest geniuses of the century; for he not only removed from his countrymen their religious disabilities, but created for himself the title of "Liberator," and that, although dead more than a third of a century, it has never since been even claimed by any man. They may say that there has been but one Daniel O'Connell, and we will not dispute the fact; but let us remind them that things have changed as much for the better, between O'Connell's day and ours, as they did between Grattan's day and O'Connell's; that the statesmanship of "iron and blood" is not now considered the highest order of statesmanship, but rather the lowest; that the sword was then mightier than the pen, while the reverse is the fact now; that this is the age of progress; that education is now more general, civilization more perfect, and men more enlightened, free and independent. Who doubts for a moment that had Walter Scott, the prince of novelists, who died as late as 1832, lived to our day, he would laugh at the idea of considering a man who proposed lighting the streets of London with gas, a dangerous person to be left at liberty? Yet in his day he entertained this opinion, absurd and silly as it seems to us, while contemplating the superior beauty and brilliancy of the electric light. When the electors of Clare sent O'Connell to represent them in the English Parliament, the intelligence did not reach the shores of America for nearly three weeks a longer time than it took Mr. Parnell to sail from New York to Queenstown; make his canvass, defeat the strong,

est man in the City of Cork, and receive congratulations from his admiring friends on this side of the Atlantic. There are now thirty nine Irish members in the English Parliament instead of one in favor of Home Rule, and millions of Irishmen are aiding them with their sympathy, their money, and their counsel. Prudence dissuades from revolution at present. It is the last resort and justifiable only when all other remedies have failed. The Irish must therefore get rid of their grievances by constitutional means if they can, by other methods, if they must. There is no longer any animosity between the Orange and the Green: both pennants now float from the same flagstaff over a united people for the first time in nearly a century. If O'Connell did much under the most adverse circumstances, what reason have we to doubt that Mr. Parnell and his associates will do more under circumstances very auspicious. The union of Protestants and Catholics is a good omen and augurs well for the ultimate success of the cause which has brought about a fraternal feeling that should have always existed.

The great curse of Ireland heretofore has been her local jealousies and internal disputes; there has been too much of the clan and too little of the national spirit in Ireland. But this deplorable state of affairs is gradually disappearing through the influence of the present civilization of the world.

It is to be feared, however, that little will be obtained from the present English Parliament: for although England has become liberal of late years, she is still unjust and cruel towards the Irish.

The cry of extreme distress that was wafted on the back of the winds to our hospitable shore a few months since, is still ringing in our ears. We have not yet forgotten the shriek of anguish that came from the famishing Irish to rend our hearts. Ireland was starving! England, which has interfered in every nation in Europe: in Austria for Hungary; in Naples under King "Bomba"; in the Papal States, and in our own country, during the late civil war, in behalf of what it called "liberty and reform," always asserting its own superiority over every other people, now stands before the civilized world convicted of allowing millions of its own

subjects, within sight of its wealthy coast, to starve. England looked on in apathy. The Queen contributed one day's salary to the famine relief fund ; the Prince of Wales gave one thousand dollars ; the rest of the royal family gave nothing ; the English nobility and English people little or nothing ; while America and France poured in their donations with generous hands. One American gentleman, whose generosity should be remembered with everlasting gratitude, gave one hundred thousand dollars, and collected nearly three times that amount to "clothe the naked and feed the hungry."

The cruel and parsimonious conduct of England has intensified Irish hate ; it has reawakened the memory of the penal laws and of confiscations ; it has sharpened the pike and polished the gun of the revolutionist ; it has rekindled the insurrectionary spirit of Fenianism ; it has increased the dynamite fund ; it has driven many of the most conservative into expressions of sedition ; it has cemented the bonds of Irish fraternity in every land where the scattered people of Ireland are to be found ; it has made the hearts of the second generation of Irishmen here throb with indignation—and a muttered curse upon the oppressive government is the voice of twenty-five millions of the offspring of Erin.

The leader of the present land reform movement in Ireland, which has aroused the attention of the civilized world, is Mr. Parnell, but should he be convicted and imprisoned, or even die to-morrow, the idea he represents will live, and Ireland will command another of her sons to take up the Unstained Banner and advance the cause of her persecuted, starving tenantry.

Men are mortal, ideas are eternal. Should Mr. Parnell fail, another will succeed, and if not by his methods by other means. His are not only the most feasible, but the only methods upon which the great majority of Irishmen will unite at the present time ; let the Irish then test ere they reject or condemn them ; they have been divided too long. The cause he champions has enemies it is true, but so had Emancipation ; it has doubting friends, but so had the Disestablishment. All doubts may be cleared away ; all enemies may be silenced by the grandeur of the

latest political triumph, and Mr. Parnell or some other distinguished Irishman may be called in the near future to the title left by O'Connell for a worthy successor.

What does Mr. Parnell seek for the Irish tenants that he should be called a *communist*? He seeks to abolish the laws of entail and primogeniture, which prevent real property from being divided up; to establish fixity of tenure; to give the tenants the right to purchase land and the privilege to live, and to curtail the powers of the landlords. All of these things have been done by countries at whose civilization England sneers.

The greatest men in England say most of them ought to be done in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone, in his Midlothian speech, said: "*The tenants chiefly effect the improvements in that country (Ireland), and they must be secured in these and their other rights, which are still often threatened or confiscated by the landlords.*" Mr. Bright said to the electors of Birmingham: "*The powers of the landlords to evict and to raise the rent reduces to a minimum, security of tenure and incentive to industry; they must therefore be curtailed or abolished.*" Are Gladstone and Bright *communists*?

But say the landlords, legislative bodies have no right to interfere with freedom of contract. In the sixteenth century, Spencer, speaking of the unsettled character of the Irish peasantry, says: "*This inconvenience may be reason enough to ground an ordinance for the good of the commonwealth against the private behoof or will of any landlord that shall refuse to grant any such term or estate unto his tenant as may tend to the good of the whole realm.*" It would hardly be considered a compliment to England to say that she was farther advanced in civilization in the *sixteenth century* than she is in the last quarter of the *nineteenth century*. Mr. Gladstone, on the 27th of November, 1879, in an address at West Calder said: "The legislature are perfectly entitled to buy up the landed proprietors for the purpose of dividing the country into small lots." This is just what the Land League wants them to do. "In principle," he says, "no objection can be taken to it. *I freely own that compulsory expropriation is a thing which is admissible, and even sound in principle.*" In theory, Mr. Gladstone is as good a Land

Leaguer as Mr. Parnell, for he admits the *soundness* of the *principle* for the triumph of which Mr. Parnell is struggling.

In 1822, J. W. Croker, Chairman of a Parliamentary Committee, described Ireland as consisting of landlords without friends or influence; peasants without an interest, almost without a livelihood in the country; nothing to defend; nothing to love; desperate and despairing; ripe and ready for a change.

"In Ireland," he says, "*tenure at will is indefinite oppression; tenure by lease oppression by lease; rents are not the proportion but nearly the whole produce.*" It need hardly be said that the state of affairs in Ireland to-day is precisely what it was in 1822. Sydney C. Buxton says: "There can be no real freedom of contract between landlord and tenant in Ireland, and therefore the *State can and should interfere in the relations between them.*"**

J. A. Farrer, says: "By what principle can we say that tenants bargaining collectively with their landlords, are not as much within their rights as a landlord bargaining singly with his tenants? Freedom of contract therefore, if it justifies anything, justifies the principles of the 'Land League,' *for those very principles are its logical and legitimate consequence?*"† Yet the English Government seeks to coerce the Land League.

Now let us see if there are any instances in which legislative bodies have interfered in favor of the tenantry of a country. In 1793 the provisions of the Permanent Settlement of India protected the tenant farmers against exactions of the landlords, by decreeing that whoever held land as a tenant for twelve years preceding, at a uniform rent, was entitled to hold it forever at that rent.

By the provisions of the Bengal Recovery of Rents Act, passed 1859, "to prevent illegal exactions and extortions" in connection with demands for rent, the rights of the tenants were reassured, and "if the land had diminished in extent from any cause or the value of its produce or productive power had decreased from any cause extraneous to the tenant,

*Buxton's Hand Book.

†Farrer Contemporary Review, February, 1881.

then he had a legal claim to an abatement of the rent to be previously paid."

In France generally since the Revolution of 1789, there has been a peasant proprietorship in the soil and in the south of France, where the *Meteyer* system prevails, the rent consists of a *fixed percentage* of the produce, so that owner and tiller prosper or suffer together.

In Portugal where the *Aforamento* tenure prevails the tenant has a hereditary lease at a *fixed rent which cannot be increased*. In Italy, by the *Contratto di livello* the owners are obliged to assign lands to the cultivators for payment of certain dues and at a *fixed rent which cannot be increased except by arbitration*. In Prussia, Saxony, Hesse, and the greater part of Germany the hereditary lease was established on state domains at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In Holland, where the *Beklem-regt* tenure exists, the tenant has the right of occupancy at a *fixed rent which cannot be increased by the proprietor*, and the right of the tenant passes even to his collateral heirs as well as to those in direct line, and can be devised, sold, let, or even mortgaged without the consent of the proprietor.

In portions of Egypt by an edict issued in 1858 the fellahs are allowed *hereditary succession which is recognized even among females*. "Lands never return to the state except in default of heirs, and in this case the village can claim precedence to the state. *Whoever reclaims uncultivated land becomes proprietor of it.*"

The Act Maria Theresa, passed June 23, 1772, declared that all waste lands of *communes* and *corporations* should be sold at once; and the law passed March 25, 1847, still in force, authorized the government to sell *communal lands* not under cultivation, and 33,000 hectares were sold under this act between 1847 and 1860.*

Prosperity and happiness reign in these countries and *famines and discontent are there unknown*.

It has been frequently stated, that the land laws of England, are precisely similar to the land laws of Ireland, and Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in his charge to the jury in the Land League case, recently tried in Dublin, goes even a step

*De Lavellye's Primitive Property.

farther, for he says, "*that the laws of Ireland are more favorable to the tenant than those of Great Britain, Belgium or the United States.*" This is not true, and Justice Fitzgerald must have known it, or ought to have known it. The laws of entail and primogeniture have been long since abolished in the United States, but they still exist in Ireland. The land laws of Belgium are just, equitable and honest, while those of Ireland are positively infamous.* Now let us see if the land laws of Ireland are similar to those of England, or, as Mr. Justice Fitzgerald asserts, "*more favorable to the tenant.*" The tenant laws of Ireland have undergone no material change since 1868, nor have those of England. Lord Cardinal Manning, writing in that year, says: "In England, the traditions of centuries, the steady growth of our social order, the ripening of our agriculture and industry, the even distribution and increase of wealth, have reduced the relation of landlord and tenant to a *fixed* though it be an *unwritten law*, by which the rights of both are protected. *Our land customs may be enforced in the Courts, and thereby have the force of law.* * * * In *three-fourths of Ireland, there are neither laws nor customs.* The tenants are tenants at will. * * * If the events which had passed in Ireland since 1810 had passed in England, *the public opinion of the latter country would have imperiously compelled the Legislature to turn our land customs into Acts of Parliament.* If any sensible portion of the people of English counties were to be seen moving down upon the Thames for embarkation to America, and dropping by the roadside from hunger and fever, and it had been heard by the wayside that they were *tenants at will*, evicted *for any cause whatsoever*, the *public opinion* of the country would have risen to render impossible the repetition of such *absolute and irresponsible* exercise of legal rights. If five millions, *i. e.*, one-fourth of the British people, had either emigrated in a mass by reason of discontent, misery or *eviction*, or had died by fever or *famine* since the year 1848, the whole *land system of England*

* In Belgium out of a population of about four millions, one million are property owners, while Ireland, with a population of about five and a half millions, has less than twenty thousand property holders.

would have been modified so as to render the return of such a *national danger* impossible forever. But *both these suppositions have been verified in Ireland.* * * * *The deepest and sorest cause of discontent is the Land Question.* * * * The Land Question, as we call it by a somewhat heartless euphemism, means hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labor spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sicknesses, deaths of parents, children, wives, the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor, when legal force like a sharp harrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind. *All this is contained in the Land Question.*" If the question of veracity could arise between one of the greatest, purest, and most honorable Englishmen living, and a weak, truculent, partizan, Irish Judge, we confidently believe that the universal verdict would be that Cardinal Manning had told the *truth*, and that Justice Fitzgerald *had not*. But how can the question of veracity arise between a man who stands like Saul, head and shoulders above his fellows; whose whole life has been devoted to the material and spiritual welfare of his countrymen; whose name is synonymous with honor, honesty, truthfulness, and patriotism, and a man who unnecessarily libels Belgium and the United States; whose position on the bench was obtained by cringing to the life-long enemy of his country, who "crooked the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning;" whose charge in the recent Land League trial, "taking it all in all," would have disgraced even the notorious Jeffreys? It would be an insult to the intelligence of our readers, even to intimate that the question of veracity could ever arise between Cardinal Manning and Justice Fitzgerald.

While the kindest, the tenderest feelings for all who aided Ireland in the hour of her dire distress, have been expressed and are still entertained, there can be no doubt that Mr. Parnell and his associates, who have dedicated their lives to the removal of the *cause* of Irish famines and Irish suffering—present and future—are the only persons who take a comprehensive view of the Irish question, and whether they succeed or fail, they are entitled to the support, the sympathy and the admiration of man-

kind. They do not sanction or approve of confiscation, as has been falsely and maliciously stated by their enemies, but even that may come if the unjust laws of entail and primogeniture and the cruel tenant laws be not abolished. Worse than confiscation may come. Assassination may do what the law fails to do. A people who find their rulers heartless or callously indifferent to their just demands or necessities, finally destroy them. They did it in France in 1789; they did it in England when they beheaded Charles the I; we did it here in the war of the Revolution. If the Irish have not succeeded in the past, it is probably owing to their impoverished and uneducated condition, both caused by centuries of English misrule. But education has become universal in Ireland. The peasants are beginning to read and think for themselves. A spirit of individualism has grown up among them; individualism which may be called the Fifth Estate, as journalism is called the Fourth Estate. Even the power of the press is giving way before individualism, the last wave in the onward roll of progress. The recent elections in Ireland leave no doubt that the influence of the Church is gradually receding from the political arena in which an independent and aggressive laicism is now all prominent.

There is no doubt that the American people who responded so promptly and so generously to the call for pecuniary aid for starving Ireland, whose national House of Representatives, by a unanimous vote, censured England for her treatment of Ireland, the majority of whose state legislatures passed resolutions to the same effect, will extend their unqualified sympathy to the Lind League movement when they realize that the Irish tenantry are struggling for their very existence and not because they believe in or approve of *communism*, as has been falsely stated by the English press. Was it *communism* to object to the stamp act? Was it *communism* to hurl the tea into the Boston harbor? If it were, then the present movement in Ireland is *communistic*, and Americans, *ever consistent, will sanction it*. The kindest feelings have always existed between Ireland and America.

There are no people who land upon our shores less foreigners in sympathy than the Irish, not that they love Ire-

land less, but America more. They can always be relied upon as the bitter enemies of oppression in every form, for the word *oppression* has been burnt into their inmost souls and has rankled there for centuries. They become American citizens from love and with enthusiasm. They have no king or queen whom they loved, to renounce allegiance to ; no home of luxury and splendor to regret ; no laws of equity and justice to sigh for ; they recall no master with tear-bathed cheeks, or moistened eyes ; they come here with the same light hearts and bright hopes with which the Hebrews of old, left Egypt for the Promised Land. This is their Canaan. Ireland owes much, very much, to America, and America owes something to Ireland. When our troops were furnishing at Valley Forge, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of the City of Philadelphia sent them clothing.

Henry Grattan, whose name is imperishably enshrined in the hearts of the Irish people, was the staunch friend of America in her struggle for independence, as is manifest in his galling invective against Flood.

History tells us that Burke, Sheridan, Barre and others, did almost as much in the English Parliament for the triumph of the American arms as Washington did in the field ; that Lynch, McKean and Carroll, with the other immortal signers of the Declaration of Independence, “pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor” to the cause of American freedom when the great Republic existed only in the bright hopes of the future ; that Sullivan and Langdon seized the guns at Newcastle which blazed forth defiance and death to the British at Bunker Hill ; that Montgomery wrote his devotion to America with his life blood at Montreal ; that General Anthony Wayne attested his fidelity at Miamis and Stony Point ; that Barry, McDonough and Stewart commanded our navies ; that Jackson, the hero of New Orleans, “had not a drop of blood in him that was not Irish ;” and that Clinton was mainly instrumental in making our State Constitution a model of religious as well as political liberty, despite the bigoted opposition of John Jay.

On nearly every page of the history of our late civil war are recorded the many deeds of valor performed by the Irish soldiers for the preservation of the Union, and grateful

America will never forget the impetuosity with which Meagher and his Irish Brigade threw themselves upon the advanced lines of the Southern army at Fair Oaks and the Seven Pines. Nor will Americans fail to recall the names of Shields, Sheridan, Kearney and Corcoran ; nor the fact that there was not a division, brigade, or even regiment in the whole army in which there were not loyal Irishmen ; nor that together with their own brave, patriotic countrymen they climbed the heights of Lookout Mountain and contended for the victory in that memorable conflict " fought above the clouds ;" stemmed the torrent, of battle at Gettysburg ; rolled back the tide at Antietam to save the *Union* and the life of the Republic.

After trampling upon the rights of a respectable minority at the expense of Parliamentary usages and in violation of the letter and spirit of the British Constitution ; after the passage of the infamous coercion acts, which spared neither women nor children, to throttle public opinion in Ireland and set at defiance public opinion and public sympathy elsewhere ; after the brutal murder of peaceable women struggling against cruel evictions ; after the unjustifiable arrest and incarceration of Davitt ; after an indecent delay, Mr. Gladstone has condescended to give his attention to what he calls " the most difficult question he has had to deal with in the course of his political life." From the extraordinary reticence of the Ministry, their unexplained delay and the high character of the English Premier, the lovers of liberty and the advocates of human rights the world over confidently hoped that the Irish Land Bill would contain a comprehensive and statesmanlike view of the Irish Question which would solve the present difficulties of Ireland to the entire satisfaction of all impartial thinkers.

But what must have been their chagrin when they read Mr. Gladstone's encomium upon *Irish landlordism*, above which " vengeance has been setting " for centuries, " like a vulture o'er a corpse soon to be tasted." Eulogize *Irish landlordism* ! that like a cankerworm has been eating the petals out of the heart of the Irish nation. His eulogy is in perfect keeping with his bill if the reports of its provisions published in the daily press be correct. No provision is contained in it for the abolition of the laws of entail and

primogeniture, which have been the ban to the amelioration of the Irish tenantry, and which have done even more than the cruel tenant laws to keep them in social chains and political slavery for centuries. By the aid of the coercion and arms acts, and a little shrewd manipulation, the meagre, inexplicit and indefinite sections of the bill in the interest of the tenants may be rendered almost nugatory. There are too many restrictions in the bill which destroy even its proposed reforms, limited as they are. But its worst section is that which gives to the Land Court the power of fixing rent and compensation. Irish Judges are the creatures of English Parliaments, and their opinions or judgments have rarely been such as to inspire the Irish people with confidence or respect.

They are mostly landed proprietors, and as their human nature is not of the highest order, they can hardly be implicitly relied upon to settle with any degree of satisfaction to the tenant the questions likely to arise between him and his landlord. It is notorious that the meanest, narrowest partizans in Ireland have been Irish Judges, and that their sole desire has always been to propitiate their masters rather than to protect their countrymen. The most cruel, heartless and exacting slave-drivers in the South were negroes, and yet they were often the most cringing and subservient in the presence of the owner. The average Irish Judge in Ireland, although like a whipped spaniel in the presence of his superiors, has ever been the arrogant, domineering negro slave-driver when dealing with his countrymen. What chance would an Irish tenant, if a Land Leaguer, have of obtaining justice from Judge Fitzgerald, who is honest and impartial, so called, compared with others who disgrace rather than adorn the bench? Yet it is to the tender mercies of this class of public functionaries that Mr. Gladstone consigns for an honest and equitable adjustment the cases of millions of the Irish people. This section of the bill is a "mockery, a delusion and a snare." Mr. Gladstone has failed, utterly, ignominiously failed to solve the Irish Question, and we must look to a greater man and another Parliament for its solution. The Land League, may, however, accept the bill, unsatisfactory and defective as it is, but to suppose that it will

satisfy the League is to conclude that its members have taken leave of their senses. It is reported by cable that the *noble* Duke of Argyll has resigned from the Cabinet because of the *revolutionary* character of the bill; this simply proves that the *noble* Duke has not read between the lines, or that he desires the resurrection of the Penal Code. It is also reported that the Gladstone Bill will not pass the House of Lords, but will be strangled there by the *hereditary peers of the most enlightened country in the world*. Before acting rashly it might be well for their *lordships* to consult the land tenures of other European countries, of half-civilized India and of barbarous Egypt, and to recall the French Revolution; the fate of Charles I., the result of the American war of Independence; the death of Maximilian; the collapse of the Napoleonic dynasty; the abolition of hereditary peers in France; the existence of a French Republic, and the assassination of the Czar. It is generally conceded that something must soon be done to pacify Ireland and relieve her from the terrible tension of the past year, but the Land League apprehends no uprising; nor do we hear any of its members hurl at the heads of the *noble lords* the volcanic outburst of Shiel: "Would you drive the country into insurrection, cut down the People and bid the yeomanry draw forth the swords clotted with the blood of 1798, that they may be brandished in massacre and sheathed in the Nation's heart."

The Land League has taken pains to avoid any conflict, for it does not wish to have Irishmen try physical conclusions with England at present. It has waged and is bravely fighting a battle of the mind, not of arms. It proposes to obtain by mental superiority what military heroes have accomplished only at the point of the bayonet, and with the blood of thousands of their countrymen. It took O'Connell twenty years to gain Catholic Emancipation. If the Land League continue its noble work with energy, prudence and loyalty, there is every prospect of victory crowning its efforts in less than ten years. The agitation should be extended into every country where England has a direct or indirect interest; the oppressed of every land should be made to feel and to realize that every link broken in the chains which have bound the Irish people so firmly, and

which have corroded so deeply, for centuries, is the breaking of a rivet in their own fetters.

The Land League should be like a man's hand, the branches like his fingers; and in sympathy, act, desire and aim like a "shut fist." No jealousies should be permitted to dwarf it; no party, sectional or national feeling to divide it; no demagogues to control it; no temporary disappointments to weaken its faith in the capacity, honor or honesty of its able leader. It should be open to all without regard to creed, nationality or political affiliation. The opposition of American *snobs* and the *indifference* and *unpatriotic conservatism* of Irish *snobs* should augment its ranks, and increase its zeal, rather than weaken its energy or lessen its membership. It is only the weak and cowardly who falter and faint before the battle; the brave and strong plant their banners upon the highest point of the enemies' citadel or die in the attempt. The heroic self-sacrifices of Michael Davitt should be an inspiration to his countrymen—the country that could produce even one such man—and Ireland has produced many—deserves to have the shackles struck from her limbs, if need be, even by the sword. Make the League universal rather than national, cosmopolitan rather than local or sectional. Have the meetings addressed by Americans, Germans, Frenchmen and Hebrews, as well as by Irishmen. The League is sure of the Irish; with judgment and tact it can make certain of the others. The great heart of Ireland throbs in sympathy with the Land League; the strong arm of Ireland is behind it; the manhood and the brains of America approve and sanction its methods and its aims, and its success in the near future is assured if it only remain united and firm to the end.

GLADSTONE & IRISH GRIEVANCES.



AN ESSAY

ON THE

IRISH LAND LAWS, TENURES AND GRIEVANCES;

THEIR PROPOSED SOLUTION;

THE GLADSTONE COERCION ACT AND LAND BILL;

AND

THE LAND LEAGUE.

BY

HENRY A. BRANN,

OF THE

New York Bar.



NEW YORK:

BENJ. H. TYRREL, PRINTER, 74 MAIDEN LANE.

1881.

PRICE 25 CENTS.

APR -0 1943



0 021 356 761 5